# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 09/853,782 | 05/14/2001 | Ikuya Morikawa | 1081.1118 | 7025 |

21171     7590     05/23/2006

STAAS & HALSEY LLP
SUITE 700
1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

| EXAMINER |
|---|
| BATES, KEVIN T |

| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|---|---|
| 2155 | |

DATE MAILED: 05/23/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

| | Application No. | Applicant(s) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| **Office Action Summary** | 09/853,782 | MORIKAWA ET AL. |
| | Examiner | Art Unit |
| | Kevin Bates | 2155 |

*-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --*

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>07 April 2006</u>.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.      2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-3,5 and 6</u> is/are pending in the application.

     4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-3, 5 and 6</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

     a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

        1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

        2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

        3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

     * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

## *Response to Amendment*

This Office Action is in response to a communication made on April 7, 2006.

Claims 1-3 and 5-6 are pending in the application.

## *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-3 and 5-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Gai (6167445) in view of Prager (5838918).

**Regarding claim 1**, Gai teaches a communication setting management system

for distributing communication characteristics setting to a plurality of communication

entities (Column 5, line 65 – Column 6, line 2), comprising:

a setting template entry/edit <u>unit operated by a administrator to</u> enter or edit a

setting template that collects contents to be set for the communication entities (Column

12, lines 21 – 30; Column 12, lines 6 – 9), with reference to information on a concrete

method of setting the communication entities;

a setting template storing <u>unit</u> storing each setting template entered or edited by

the setting template entry/edit <u>unit as operated by the administrator</u> (Column 8, lines 1 –

5);

an application rule entry/edit <u>unit as operated by a administrator to enter or edit</u> application rules prescribing rules of <u>corresponding to the</u> setting template, <u>entered or edited in the setting template entry/edit unit operated by the first administrator, which</u> is to be applied to a communication having a specific attribute (Column 12, lines 21 – 24);

an application rule storing <u>unit</u> storing each application rule entered or edited by entry/edit means; and

retrieval and response unit selecting an application rule from the application rule storing means in accordance with an attribute of a corresponding destination communication entity (Column 12, lines 21 – 24), reading from the setting template storing means a setting template having a setting template name specified by the selected application rule, and distributing the read setting template to the corresponding destination communication entity (Column 6, lines 10 – 26; Column 13, line 63 – Column 14, line 4).

Gai does not explicitly indicate more than one administrator being able to perform separate functions.

Prager teaches a system for making templates to implement policies in a system (Column 5, lines 8 – 19). As part of Prager's system, he discloses that there are some more important global actions that only higher level authority administrators can perform, in comparison to lower level actions in which lower level authority administrators can perform (Column 11, lines 34 – 42; Column 13, lines 26 – 44).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Prager's teaching of having higher and lower authority

actions in a template system to ensure only administrators with the proper high level authority are able to perform actions of more global performance and impact to protect the system from mistakes by lower level administrators.

**Regarding claim 2**, Gai teaches the communication setting management system according to claim 1, further comprising:  setting template collective entering means for collectively entering a group of previously defined setting templates into the setting template storing means (Column 13, line 63 – Column 14, line 4).

**Regarding claim 3**, Gai teaches the communication setting management system according to claim 1, further comprising:

a plurality of management domains each having at least one communication entity (Column 6, lines 2 – 7), the management domains communicating via a network, and a communication setting management apparatus is disposed in each of the plurality of management domains (Column 10, lines 44 – 47); and

a corresponding management domain imparting on a management domain basis, a different communication characteristics settings to respective communications between communication entities belonging to different management domains, each communication characteristics setting being managed on a corresponding management domain basis (Column 10, lines 38 – 47).

**Regarding claim 5**, Gai teaches the communication setting management system according to claim 3, further comprising:

a contradiction detection function unit for mutually interchanging information with a communication setting management apparatuses disposed in respective, different

management domains, and detecting a contradiction between the information and the

setting template and the application rule of its own management domain (Column 17,

lines 33 – 44).

**Regarding claim 6**, Gai teaches the communication setting management system

according to claim 5, further comprising:

a contradiction modification function unit for modifying a contradiction at the tine

when the contradiction is detected that a setting template or setting templates specified

by the contradiction detection function unit according to the application rule to be the

same, instead are not (Column 18, lines 32 – 35, where the policy translator handles

conflicting roles and rules through priority).

### *Response to Arguments*

Applicant's arguments filed April 7, 2006 have been fully considered but they are

not persuasive.

Regarding claim 1, the applicant argues that the reference, Prager, does not

teach how a first administrator creates a setting template and a second creates the

application rule.  The examiner disagrees, as seen in Column 13, lines 26 – 44; Prager

discloses the roles of a central and local administrator.  Included in this disclosure is the

idea that the central administrators are responsible for central configuration database

and template models (Column 13, lines 32 – 35), while the local administrator works

with templates to create particular records (Column 13, lines 40 – 44) and attributes for

a subset of subscribing systems (Column 13, lines 35 – 39).  So seen in the reference,

Prager, it is taught that the central and local administrators work together on the same

templates to go for a gobal model to a local particular attributes, as disclosed in the claimed invention.

## *Conclusion*

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kevin Bates whose telephone number is (571) 272-3980. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 am - 4:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Saleh Najjar can be reached on (571) 272-4006. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

KB

KB
May 18, 2006

SALEH NAJJAR
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER